DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 035 HE 024 855

AUTHOR Kelly, Diana K.
TITLE Part-time Faculty in the Community College: A Study of Their Qualifications, Frustrations, and Involvement. AIR 1991 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (31st, San Francisco, CA, May 26-29, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Faculty College Relationship; Full Time Faculty; Higher Education; Multiple Regression Analysis; *Part Time Faculty; Profiles; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Morale; *Teacher Motivation; *Teacher Qualifications; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum; California; *Fullerton College CA

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses a study that examined the characteristics of part-time faculty in order to gain a better understanding of their needs so that better decisions might be made in part-time faculty management. Implications for institutional researchers who plan to study part-time faculty were also examined, including the challenges of obtaining responses from part-time faculty and the ethical issues involved in studying this group. The study was conducted during the fall 1988 semester at Fullerton College, a large suburban community college in Southern California. Of the 371 part-time faculty who were surveyed, usable responses were received from 314. The issues addressed were (1) the qualifications of part-time faculty; (2) their frustrations concerning pay and resource allocation, and their general feelings about their status in relation to full-time faculty; and (3) their involvement in the school and with other faculty. Among major findings were: that part-time faculty averaged lower degree attainment but high other professional qualifications; that part-time faculty feel they are treated as second-class citizens; and that few feel involved with the college but that 60 percent want more involvement. Also provided are seven detailed profiles of part-time faculty which were developed through multiple regression analysis. Contains 13 references. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

16

ED 336085

Part-time Faculty in the Community College:
A Study of their Qualifications, Frustrations, and Involvement

Diana K. Kelly

Staff Development Coordinator

Fullerton College

321 E. Chapman Ave

Fullerton, Calif. 92634

(714) 992-7278

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 024 855

Running head: PART-TIME FACULTY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Thirty-First Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at The Westin St. Francis, San Francisco, California, May 26-29, 1991. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Jean Endo
Chair and Editor
Forum Publications Editorial
Advisory Committee

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to examine the characteristics of part-time faculty in order to gain a better understanding of their needs so that better decisions might be made in managing part-time faculty. This study of part-time faculty was conducted during the 1988 Fall semester at a large suburban community college in Southern California. Of the 371 part-time faculty who were surveyed, usable responses were received from 314 for a response rate of over 84 percent. The following issues were addressed by this study: the qualifications of part-time faculty, the frustrations of part-time faculty, and the involvement of part-time faculty. The results include seven detailed profiles of part-time faculty which were developed through multiple regression analysis.

Part-time Faculty in the Community College:
A Study of their Qualifications, Frustrations, and Involvement

Part-time faculty have always been a matter of concern to those in the community college. In many community colleges, part-time faculty outnumber full-time faculty. Although colleges find part-time faculty attractive for their flexibility, convenience, and lower rate of pay, college administrators are concerned that part-time faculty may not be well-qualified. Part-time faculty are frustrated because they receive less pay than full-time faculty and are treated as "second class citizens" even though their qualifications may be identical to those of full-time faculty. Administrators believe that the lower rate of pay is justified on the basis of workload: part-time faculty are not expected to be involved in campus committees, nor are they usually required to hold office hours. But when part-time faculty do only what is expected of them by coming in to teach their classes and then leaving, it is often assumed that they are not interested in being more involved.

The purpose of this study was to provide community college administrators with a greater understanding of part-time faculty so that they might manage part-timers more effectively. This study attempted to answer three questions. First, how well-qualified are the part-time faculty? Second, what are the frustrations of the part-time faculty, and how can institutions resolve these frustrations? Finally, are part-time faculty interested in greater involvement?

This paper will also examine the implications for institutional researchers who plan to study part-time faculty, including the challenges of obtaining responses from part-time faculty and the ethical issues involved in studying part-time faculty.

Background on Part-time Faculty

Employment of Part-time Faculty.

The number of part-time faculty employed in higher education nationwide has increased from 104,000 in 1970 to 256,000 in 1986. (National Center on Education Statistics, 1988, p. 177). In 1987 the part-time faculty population represented 14 percent of the total faculty

in public four-year colleges, but 35 percent of the total faculty in two-year colleges (Chronicle, 1991, p.57).

Motivational Characteristics of Part-time Faculty.

A typology of part-time faculty was developed by Tuckman (1981, pp.4-5) which includes the following seven mutually exclusive groups: 1) semi-retired persons; 2) graduate students; 3) "Hopeful full-timers;" 4) "Full-mooners" who work full-time elsewhere; 5) "Homeworkers" who take care of children at home; 6) "Part-mooners" who teach part-time at several institutions; and 7) "Part-unknowners" who do not fall into any of the first six groups. A second typology consisting of three mutually exclusive groups was developed from the results of a survey conducted at Hillsborough Community College in Tampa, Florida: 1) "Education Professionals" who are employed full-time as educators in other institutions; 2) "Noneducation Professionals" who are employed full-time in business and industry; and 3) "Permanent Part-timers" who are currently teaching part-time but desire a full-time teaching position (Leslie, Kellams, & Gunne, 1982, pp. 38-40). George B. Vaughan, president of Piedmont Community College in Charlottesville, categorized part-time faculty into two groups: the "independents" who have another full-time job, and the "dependents" who are hoping for a full-time position (1986). One of the difficulties in developing a motivational typology of part-time faculty is the potential for overlap. For instance, it is possible that someone currently working in business has a desire for a full-time faculty position. It is even more likely that Vaughn's "Part-Mooners" might also be "Hopeful Full-timers."

Qualifications of Part-Time Faculty.

Bowen & Schuster (1986) note that although many part-time faculty are "highly capable and add to the quality and diversity of available talent" (p.63), many are of "mediocre talent and training." In a 1987 California Community Colleges study of part-time instruction, full-time faculty had higher academic credentials than part-time faculty, although part-timers held more professional degrees (p.29), and it was recognized that those in vocational fields bring specialized expertise to the classroom.

Frustrations of Part-time Faculty.

Part-time faculty often become frustrated because they are not a part of the mainstream of the college, they are paid less than full-time faculty, and they may even be perceived by some full-time faculty as inferior faculty members (Biles & Tuckman, 1986; Flynn et al., 1986). Judith Gappa notes additional working conditions of part-time faculty which are likely to produce stress: absence of participation in decision-making; inadequate performance evaluation; last preference in workload assignment; and job insecurity (1987). Tucker observes, "If part-time instructors are either unhappy with their conditions of employment or inadequately skilled to do a satisfactory job of teaching, the resulting student dissatisfaction could affect enrollments" (1984, p.366).

Involvement of Part-time Faculty.

The 1986 AAUP report on non-tenure track appointments notes that part-time faculty "are neither required nor expected, and often not permitted, to advise students, to play a role in faculty personnel and budget matters, or to participate in the development of curricula and the formulation and implementation of academic policy" (Heller, 1986, p.26). However, a survey of the Houston Community College part-time faculty revealed that they were interested in greater involvement through further contact with other faculty and through faculty development activities (Brams, 1983, p.39).

Although the literature of part-time faculty is vast, it is also limited in scope. First, the literature reflects an ongoing assumption held by most administrators and full-time faculty, which may not necessarily be accurate, that the part-timers are somehow "second rate" faculty. Second, much of the literature tends to focus on either the frustrations of part-timers, usually in stories told by individual part-time faculty, or the frustrations of department chairs who manage increasing numbers of part-time faculty. Finally, the few motivational typologies of part-time faculty which have been developed have mutually exclusive group categories which may easily overlap. This study attempts to increase the understanding of part-time faculty in the community college by addressing these issues.

Methodology

The data used in this study were gathered during the Fall semester, 1988, at Fullerton College, a large suburban community college with a student population of about 20,000, a full-time faculty of 280, and a part-time faculty of 371. Of the 371 part-time faculty who were surveyed, usable responses were received from 314 for a response rate of over 84 percent.

The survey was first administered at the opening meeting of evening faculty at the beginning of the Fall semester. Surveys were sent through the campus mail to those who did not attend the meeting. Surveys were numbered for follow-up purposes in case of non-response. Two weeks later, a reminder notice was sent to those who had not returned the surveys. After another two weeks, a second copy of the survey was sent with a second reminder notice to those who had not responded. A third reminder notice was sent with a third copy of the survey one month later. Finally, a fourth copy of the survey with a fourth copy of the survey was sent one month later.

The survey instrument included five sections which measured teaching methods used, interest in faculty development, involvement in the college and in the division, professional involvement in the discipline and in teaching, and demographic characteristics. Frequencies were tabulated for all variables, including two open-ended questions. Professional involvement in the discipline was tabulated only for those who classified themselves as vocational faculty. Involvement variables were tabulated only for those who were not brand new faculty members.

Seven structural characteristics of part-time faculty were used for a further analysis of the data which included chi square analysis and stepwise multiple regression analysis. The first characteristic, "length of teaching", had the following five categories according to self-reported number of years spent teaching part-time at Fullerton College: new faculty; up to 1 year completed; 2-5 years completed; 6-10 years completed; over 10 years completed. The remaining six structural characteristics were dichotomies: 2) "Hopeful Full-timers" who desire a full-time teaching position (and those who do not); 3) vocational and academic faculty (self-classified); 4) day and evening faculty (those teaching any classes during the day were classified as "day" faculty); 5) "Moonlighters" who work full-time in a position outside of

education (and those who do not); 6) "Full-time Teachers" who teach full-time in another institution (and those who do not); and 7) "Freeway Fliers" who teach part-time in at least one other institution (and those who do not).

First, chi-square analysis was used to determine significant relationships between the seven structural characteristics of part-time faculty and the following twelve involvement variables: (Note: those who were brand new faculty were deleted from this analysis because they had not yet had an opportunity for involvement.) 1) frequency of conversations with division dean; 2) frequency of conversations with department chair; 3) frequency of conversations with other faculty members; 4) desire to meet more faculty; 5) when new, having received good guidance from a full-time faculty member; 6) when new, having received good guidance from the division dean or department chair; 7) receiving regular memos from the division dean or department chair; 8) attendance at division or department meetings; 9) feelings of involvement with the college; 10) feelings of involvement in the division or department; 11) desire for greater involvement with the college; 12) desire for greater involvement with the division or department. Multiple regression analysis was then used to determine which of the twelve involvement variables were the strongest predictors of the seven structural characteristics.

Chi-square analysis was also used to determine significant relationships between the seven structural characteristics and the following twelve professional profile variables: 1) number of years of part-time teaching at Fullerton College; 2) teaching day or evening classes; 3) number of hours of teaching per week at Fullerton College during the Fall semester; 4) number of different classes taught at Fullerton College during the Fall semester; 5) hoping to teach full-time; 6) teaching in a vocational or academic discipline; 7) current full-time employment in the profession (only for vocational faculty); 8) current full-time teaching in another institution; 9) current part-time teaching in other institutions; 10) age; 11) gender; 12) highest degree earned. Multiple regression analysis was then used to determine the twelve professional profile variables were the strongest predictors of the seven characteristics.

Results and Discussion

This study was designed to answer the following three questions: 1) Are the part-time faculty well-qualified?; 2) What are the frustrations of the part-time faculty; and 3) How involved are part-time faculty, and are they interested in greater involvement? Frequencies were tabulated on relevant survey items to obtain the answers to these questions. In addition, to gain a better understanding of part-time faculty seven structural characteristics were examined through an analysis of involvement variables and professional profile variables.

Qualifications of Part-Time Faculty.

Academic Qualifications. Overall, the full-time faculty of Fullerton College have better academic qualifications than the part-time faculty. In 1986 over 75 percent of the full-time faculty held a master's degree and about 12 percent had earned doctorates [Kelly, 1987]. Interestingly, a higher percentage of the part-time faculty, over 16 percent, have doctorates. But significantly fewer hold a master's degree: only half of all part-time faculty. Only about eight percent of full-time faculty have a bachelor's degree as the highest degree earned, but over 21 percent of the part-time faculty have a bachelor's degree. Over eleven percent of part-time faculty have not earned a bachelor's degree, but only two percent of the full-time faculty have less than a bachelor's degree [Kelly, 1987].

Vocational Qualifications. Although their degree attainment tends to be lower than academic faculty, vocational part-time faculty are very well qualified in their profession. Over 85 percent are currently working in their field, and most are working full-time. About 90 percent of the vocational faculty have worked full-time in their profession at some point in their career. Most vocational faculty bring many years of experience to the classroom: over 27 percent have worked over 20 years in their profession; 31 percent have worked between 15 and 20 years; and 22 percent have worked ten years.

Frustrations of Part-time Faculty.

The frustrations of part-time faculty expressed in this study are consistent with the literature. Generally, part-time faculty feel that they are being treated as second class

citizens: part-time faculty with the same qualifications as full-time faculty are paid less for teaching the same classes, they have no benefits, and they have no guarantee of employment from one semester to the next. Colleges tend to rationalize the lower pay by also noting that part-time faculty are not expected to hold office hours or provide institutional service through committee work. However, in reality, many part-time faculty stated that they need an office in which to meet with their students before class. This seems to indicate that at least some part-time faculty do hold "office hours," even though they are not required to do so.

Many faculty noted that they would like to teach more classes, and slightly over half stated that they would like a full-time position. One of the frustrations often mentioned by part-time faculty is the uncertainty of having a teaching job from one semester to the next. One part-time instructor noted, "As a minimum it would help to be consulted or at least advised when the night or time of the class I've taught for years is changed!"

Some part-time faculty simply want to be treated with more respect and recognized as individuals who contribute their expertise to the department and to the college. One part-timer wrote: "Notice we're here. Part-timers are not a 'real part of the school.' Look in the directory." Another commented, "Make part-time instructors feel like we belong and are not just a convenience for them to fill a vacant spot no one else wants." Several had comments about wanting to be treated as a part of the team. One wrote, "Listen to what I have to say. Nobody asks. I feel uneasy when I have a comment or suggestion. I don't think anybody wants it."

Involvement of Part-time Faculty.

Current Involvement and Desire for More Involvement. Only one fifth of the part-time faculty feel involved in their division, and even fewer feel involved in the college. However, over 60 percent want more involvement. Those who feel most involved have been teaching longer, but newer faculty desire more involvement. Those who teach in vocational fields feel involved, and those who teach academic subjects want more involvement. Daytime part-timers and those who attend division meetings feel more involved. Those who hope to teach full-time and those who want to meet more faculty desire more involvement. And interestingly, males feel

involved, but females desire more involvement. Many of these results can be attributed to the basic differences between vocational and academic faculty. Part-time faculty in vocational fields attend meetings, and are likely to be male. Academic faculty are more likely to be female, they hope to teach full-time, and they want to meet more faculty. Although daytime faculty are more likely to teach in academic subjects, they are also more likely to attend division meetings. However, day faculty represent only about one quarter of all part-time faculty in this study.

Communication with Division Deans and Department Chairs. Over half of the part-time faculty talk to their department chair at least once per month, and 42 percent talk to their division dean at least once each month. Part-time faculty who received good guidance from their division dean when they were new were likely to talk more frequently to the division chair, and felt more involved in the division and in the college.

Communication with other faculty. Only half of the part-time faculty talk to other faculty in their division once each week. But half of the part-timers would also like to meet more faculty. Many part-time faculty members simply want to be included in department activities. One wrote, "This year was the first time I was invited to the luncheon at the beginning of the semester. That was nice!" In a chi square analysis, a significant relationship was shown between receiving guidance from the division dean and receiving guidance from a full-time faculty member. In addition, those who received good guidance from a full-time faculty member were likely to want more involvement in the college.

Department Meetings. Most part-time faculty stated that they did not attend division meetings because they were held at times when they were unavailable to attend. Moreover, many part-time faculty assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that the meetings are intended for full-time faculty only. But quite a few part-time faculty commented that they would like to be invited to department meetings with full-time faculty and with other part-time faculty, and several mentioned that it would be a good idea to have evening meetings for part-time faculty. It is important to note that the multiple regression analysis showed that the strongest predictor of involvement in the department was attending department meetings.

Several respondents remarked that they would like to have an opportunity to give input into curriculum matters and departmental decisions. Comments in the survey included the following suggestions: "Allow us to give more course input;" "Listen to our input regarding subject matter;" "Involve part-time instructors in department decisions."

Involvement in Faculty Development. Instructional topics are of greatest interest to part-time faculty, especially those involving motivational techniques for the classroom, teaching underprepared students, teaching adult learners, and increasing student retention. This seems to indicate a desire for instructional improvement, and an interest in incorporating new instructional techniques. Part-time faculty who work full-time in business are unlikely to have previous teaching experience, and may become frustrated at their own lack of teaching experience. Some indicated that they felt embarrassed to go to their division dean for help, because they believed that if they were hired to teach, they should already know how to teach.

Many part-time faculty also indicated an interest in learning more about the policies and procedures of Fullerton College. In particular, part-time faculty stated that when they were new it would have been helpful to know more about the characteristics of the student population, how to find various offices and people on campus, policies which must be followed, and other basic information about the college such as procedures for ordering audio-visual equipment, availability of various student services, and availability of clerical services for typing and duplicating course materials. Over 82 percent of the part-time faculty agreed that a handbook which incorporated this information would be helpful.

Seven Profiles of Part-Time Faculty

1. Length of teaching. Over 17 percent of the part-time faculty were new to Fullerton College in the semester the survey was administered; 19 percent had been teaching at Fullerton College for up to one year; 28 percent had been teaching between two and five years; 16 percent from six to ten years; and over 20 percent had been at Fullerton for over ten years.

In the chi-square analysis, three of the twelve involvement variables produced significant relationships (less than .05) with years of teaching part-time at the college. First, those who

feel the most involved with the college have been teaching part-time at the college for over ten years. However, unlike those who have been teaching up to one year, they do not want more involvement in the college or in the division. The results of the multiple regression analysis (R square=.09) indicated that those who have been teaching longer have no desire for greater involvement in the division and tend to talk less frequently with the department chair than newer part-time faculty.

In the analysis of Professional Profile variables, eight of the twelve variables showed a significant relationship below .05 in the chi square analysis. Those who have been teaching over 10 years are likely to teach in the evening, teach three hours or less per week, do not hope to teach full-time, are currently teaching full-time, are likely to be age 50 or older, and are likely to be male. Faculty who have completed 6 to 10 years of teaching are likely to be working full-time in their profession and are unlikely to be teaching part-time in other institutions. Those who have been teaching between 2 and 5 years are the most likely to be teaching part-time at another institution, and teach the greatest number of hours: over seven hours per week. Finally, the newest faculty who have been teaching up to one year are very likely to be teaching during the day, hope to teach full-time, do not work full-time or teach full-time, are likely to be under forty years of age, and are likely to be female. The multiple regression (R square=.30) revealed similar results. The strongest predictor of longevity as a part-time faculty member was teaching in the evening, followed by age, gender, teaching more classes, working full-time, and teaching full-time.

2. "Hopeful Full-timers". Slightly over half of all of the part-time faculty, 56 percent, indicated that they would like to teach full-time.

Three of the twelve involvement variables showed a significant relationship at the .00001 level in the chi square analysis. The "hopeful full-timers" want to meet more faculty and want to become more involved in the college and in the division. In addition, three involvement variables were significantly related at less than .05: those who hope to teach full-time talk to the department chair frequently, and as new faculty they received good guidance from a full-

time faculty member and from the division dean. The multiple regression analysis (R square=.17) showed that the strongest predictor of "hopeful full-timers" is a desire for more involvement in the division, followed by a desire to meet more faculty, talking to the department chair frequently, and receiving memos regularly.

In the chi square analysis, there were significant relationships with ten of the Professional Profile variables, seven of which were at or below .001 significance. "Hopeful full-timers" tend to be newer faculty who have been teaching one year or less, teach day classes, teach over seven hours per week, teach in academic subjects, do not work full-time in their field, teach part-time in other institutions, are under forty, are female, and have a master's degree. In the multiple regression analysis (R square = .21), the strongest predictor of "Hopeful full-timers" was not working full-time, followed by teaching part-time in another institution, having earned a master's degree or doctorate, teaching a greater number of hours at the college, and being a new part-time faculty member.

3. Vocational and Academic Faculty. According to their own self-classification, 40 percent of the part-time faculty teach in vocational fields, and 60 percent teach in academic subjects.

Three of the twelve involvement variables were significantly associated (significance less than .01) with teaching in a vocational or academic subject area in the chi square analysis. "Vocational faculty" attend division meetings and feel involved in their division, but do not want more involvement in their division. Two additional variables were significant at less than .05: "vocational faculty" receive memos from their division dean, but they do not want to meet more faculty, and do not want more involvement in the college. The reverse is true of academic faculty: they are less likely to attend meetings, do not receive memos from their division dean, and feel less involved in their division, but they would like to meet faculty, and would like to become more involved in the college and in their division. In the multiple regression analysis (R square=.08), the strongest predictor of vocational faculty was feeling involved in the division, followed by a lack of desire for greater involvement in the division, and attending division meetings.

Three of the Professional Profile variables were significant at less than .0001 in the chi square analysis of Vocational and Academic faculty: "Vocational faculty" tend to teach in technical education, business education, and career education and they tend to have a bachelor's degree or less; "Academic faculty" tend to have a master's degree or doctorate, they tend to teach part-time at other colleges and would like a full-time teaching position. In addition, the following relationships were significant at less than .05: "Vocational faculty" are more likely to work full-time in their profession, they teach in the evening, they teach a greater number of classes than "Academic faculty," and they are likely to be male (significance= .02). In the multiple regression analysis (R square=.27) the strongest predictor of "Vocational faculty" was a lower academic degree, followed by not teaching part-time or full-time in other institutions.

4. Day and Evening Faculty. Seventy-three percent of the part-time faculty teach only in the evening, and 27 percent teach day classes only or day and evening classes.

According to the chi square analyses of involvement variables, "day faculty" talk to the department chair (significance=.0007) and other department faculty (significance=.02) more frequently than "evening faculty". "Day faculty" are also more likely to attend division meetings than "evening faculty." The multiple regression analysis (R square=.06) revealed similar results: "day faculty" were more likely to talk to the department chair frequently, and were more likely to attend division meetings than "evening faculty."

Four of the twelve Professional Profile variables were significant at or below the .0001 level. "Evening faculty" tend to have been teaching part-time over 10 years, teach up to three hours per week, are likely to be working full-time, and are unlikely to desire á full-time teaching position. "Day faculty" are likely to have been teaching part-time for up to one year, teach over seven hours per week, are unlikely to be working full-time, and would like a full-time teaching position. The following four variables showed a significant relationship at or below .005: "Evening faculty" tend to be male, teach one class, are likely to teach full-time and unlikely to teach part-time at other institutions. "Day faculty" are likely to be female, teach three or more classes, are unlikely to teach full-time, but probably teach part-time at other

institutions. Finally, two variables were significant at .01: "Day faculty" tend to teach academic subjects, "Evening faculty" tend to teach vocational subjects, and "Day faculty" tend to be younger than "Evening faculty". In the multiple regression analysis (R square= .19) only three variables showed strong predictive value: "Evening faculty" are likely to have been teaching part-time longer, teach fewer hours, and work full-time in their field.

5. "Moonlighters". Nearly half of all part-time faculty, 49 percent, are currently working full-time in the profession in which they teach.

No significant relationship was found between working full-time in another job and any of the involvement variables in the chi square analysis. However, the multiple regression (R square=.02) showed that "Moonlighters" tend to talk less frequently with other faculty.

According to the chi square analysis of Professional Profile variables, the following six variables were significant at less than .0001: "Moonlighters", those who work full-time in their profession, do not want a full-time teaching position, do not teach part-time in other institutions, have earned a bachelor's degree, are male, teach evening courses, and teach up to three hours per week. Also, "Moonlighters" are likely to have been teaching part-time from 6 to 10 years (significance=.0003), are likely to teach in vocational fields (significance=.008), and are likely to teach full-time (significance=.02). "Moonlighters" were predicted with five variables in the multiple regression analysis (R square=.21): they do not hope to teach full-time; they do not teach part-time at another institution; they are male; they teach fewer hours; and they have been teaching part-time longer than those who do not work full-time.

6. "Full-time teachers". Only 17 percent of the part-time faculty are currently teaching full-time in another institution: a high school (12 percent), or college (5 percent).

In both the chi square analysis (significance=.03) and the multiple regression analysis (R square=.02), one significant relationship was found among the involvement variables: those who teach full-time in another institution do not feel that they received good guidance from their division dean when they were new faculty members.

Five of the twelve Professional Profile variables were significantly related (less than .05 significance) to teaching full-time at other institutions. "Full-time teachers" are likely to have taught part-time for over 10 years, tend to teach in the evening, do not teach part-time in other institutions, have earned a master's degree, and, oddly, are more likely to also work full-time in their profession than those who are not full-time teachers. In the multiple regression analysis (R square=.09), the three predictors of "Full-time teachers" were not teaching part-time in another institution, teaching part-time longer, and teaching in an academic field.

7. "Freeway fliers". Thirty-six percent of the part-time faculty teach part-time in at least one other institution.

The chi square analysis of involvement variables revealed no significant relationships . In the multiple regression analysis, no variables entered the regression.

In the chi-square analysis of Professional Profile variables, eight variables were significantly related (at or below .001) to teaching part-time at other institutions . "Freeway fliers" are likely to have been teaching part-time between two and five years; they teach day classes; they would like a full-time teaching position; they tend to teach in academic subjects; they are more likely to be female than male; they are unlikely to work full-time in their profession; they are unlikely to teach full-time in another institution; and they are likely to have earned a Master's degree . The multiple regression analysis (R square=.18) showed that the strongest predictors of "Freeway fliers" were, in order, not working full-time in the profession, hoping to teach full-time, not teaching full-time in another institution, and teaching in an academic subject area.

Implications of the Seven Profiles

The development of the seven profiles through this data analysis has contributed to a greater understanding of the part-time faculty of Fullerton College. However, it is important to note that the characteristics of these seven profiles may vary from one institution to another. For this reason, it is recommended that institutional researchers study the part-time faculty at their own institutions to discover the unique characteristics of their part-time faculty.

Through the examination of these seven profiles for the part-time faculty on one campus, it becomes apparent that it is not possible to make sweeping generalizations about part-time faculty. For this reason, the diversity in involvement and professional characteristics should be considered for the effective management of part-time faculty.

Conclusions and Implications for Institutional Researchers

The results of this study indicate that part-time faculty are well-qualified individuals who are frustrated about their "second class" status and who generally are interested in becoming more involved in the institution. Colleges may wish to consider treating part-time faculty as valuable human resources rather than as "faculty of convenience" by resolving some of the frustrations of part-time faculty and by making efforts to increase their involvement.

Implications for Institutional Researchers

Institutional researchers may want to consider doing an in-depth study of the part-time faculty on their own campuses to determine the characteristics of the part-time faculty, as well as their frustrations and their involvement. The findings of a specific campus-based study are more valuable than national studies because they provide the institution with the information necessary to break the stereotypes and misconceptions about part-time faculty on that campus. Through such institutional studies, the specific needs of the part-time faculty on a particular campus may be met more effectively. Follow-up institutional research studies may be required to continue to monitor the satisfaction of the part-time faculty and to determine more effective ways in which to involve part-time faculty in the college.

Before doing a study of part-time faculty, two ethical implications should be considered. First, a study of part-time faculty should probably not be done unless the campus leadership indicates a genuine interest in taking positive steps to improve the working conditions for part-time faculty. As a researcher it is interesting to come up with data on part-time faculty, but the act of surveying implies that something will be done in response to the results of the survey. If nothing is done, part-time faculty may feel even more frustrated. For this reason, survey

questions should address issues which can be addressed by the institution rather than issues about which the institution is unwilling or unable to address.

A second ethical consideration is the issue of confidentiality. Confidentiality is essential for candid responses which will reveal important and usable information. But more importantly, part-time faculty who never know whether they will be re-hired from one semester to the next must be assured that their responses will be confidential. In this study, the surveys were number coded for follow-up purposes only. The list of names and number codes was kept only by the researcher, and was destroyed after the fourth follow-up surveys were mailed. The data on faculty division affiliation was never analyzed with individual characteristics (such as age, gender, length of teaching) which could be used to reveal the identity of individual respondents.

Researching part-time faculty presents a practical challenge which may not be immediately obvious. Because the college is generally a small part of the very busy and scattered life of a part-time faculty member, it is extremely difficult to obtain survey responses. In this study, many surveys sent through campus mail ended up in the trash bins as part-timers sorted quickly through their mail on their way to class.

In order to obtain a good response rate in surveying part-time faculty, several steps are recommended. First, if possible, try to have part-time faculty complete the survey at an all-campus meeting of evening faculty, if such a meeting is held in your institution. This will produce many responses quickly. Second, if surveys are sent through campus mail, they will receive more attention if they are in a sealed envelope with the faculty name hand-written on the outside of the envelope. Computer-generated labels tend to get less attention. Third, recognize that many follow-ups will be essential for a good response rate. To get a response rate of 84 percent, four follow-ups (the last three with surveys attached) were sent to faculty after the initial distribution. Finally, it may be wise to consider mailing the last two or three follow-ups to the home address. Many part-time faculty do not check their campus mail every time they are on campus. For this reason, surveys mailed to homes of part-time faculty tended to get more attention than surveys sent through campus mail.

References

Biles, G. E., & Tuckman, H. P. (1986). Part-time faculty personnel management policies. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). American professors: A national resource imperiled. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brams, P. C. (1983). What makes part-timers tick? Journal of Staff, Program, & Organizational Development, 1 (2), 39-42.

California Community Colleges Office of the Chancellor (1987, January). Study of part-time instruction. Report of the Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, Sacramento, California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 449).

Chronicle of Higher Education (1991). Almanac of Higher Education 1991. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Flynn, E. A., Flynn, J. F., Grimm, N., & Lockhart, T. (1986). The part-time problem: Four voices. Academe, 72, 12-18.

Gappa, J. M. (1987). The stress-producing working conditions of part-time faculty. In P. Seldin (Ed.), New directions for teaching and learning, no. 29. Coping with faculty stress (pp. 33-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Heller, S. (1986, July 30). Extensive use of temporary teachers is crippling academe, AAUP charges. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp.23, 26.

Kelly, D. K. (1987). Profile of the Fullerton College faculty: A comparison of the faculty of 1976 and 1986. Unpublished seminar paper, The Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California.

Leslie, D. W., Kellams, S. E., & Gunne, G. M. (1982). Part-time faculty in American higher education. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Tucker, A. (1984). Chairing the academic department. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Tuckman, H. P., & Tuckman, B. H. (1981). Who are the part-time faculty are what are the colleges doing for them? Current issues in Higher Education, no. 4, pp.4-5.

Vaughan, G. B. (1986). Part-time faculty: Nemesis or savior? In B. W. Dziech (Ed.), New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 53, Controversies and Decisions in Hard Economic Times. (pp.23-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.